

# Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary

Application No.

10/686,791

Applicant(s)

HEIKKILA, KURT E.

Examiner

Jessica L. Rossi

Art Unit

1733

## All Participants:

(1) Jessica L. Rossi.

(2) Mr. Kerr.

Status of Application: \_\_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: 10 May 2005

Time: \_\_\_\_\_

## Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

## Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

Prior art documents discussed:

## Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

## Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

Examiner first called Mr. Kerr to propose cancelling claims 18-30 and 32-34 since the limitations set forth in claims 18 and 32 are obvious based on the prior art teachings of Guhl (US 6055783) or Crandell (US 6886297) taken in view of Lautenschlaeger (US 5234730). Mr. Kerr agreed to this amendment; however, examiner then realized that claim 4 was also obvious based on the combination of Guhl or Crandell taken in view of Lautenschlaeger since the claim does not exclude the adhesion blocker being incorporated into the sealant before the sealant is applied to the groove - see column 5, lines 8-32 of Lautenschlaeger. Therefore, the examiner further proposed amending claim 4 to state that the adhesion blocker is applied onto the dual state adhesive already located in the groove to distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. However, after proposing this amendment, it dawned on the examiner that it is known in the adhesive bonding art to apply a solution to the surface of an adhesive before contacting the adhesive to a glass surface wherein the solution acts as a lubricant so that the adhesive can be easily moved on the glass surface and accurately positioned before the solution is removed and bonding between the adhesive and glass takes place (see "citation of pertinent prior art" in paragraph 12 of the present office action). As a result, the examiner was compelled to send out a final rejection.